



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,660	11/04/2003	Ching-Hui Chen	32052-8567.US	6469
25096	7590	02/24/2009	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP			STOREY, WILLIAM C	
PATENT-SEA				
P.O. BOX 1247			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,660	CHEN ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
WILLIAM C. STOREY	2625	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) WILLIAM C. STOREY. (3) _____.

(2) Cameron Pilling. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 February 2009

Time: ~1:30 PM E.S.T

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/William C Storey/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner previously noted that it appeared that proposed amendments submitted by the applicant appeared to overcome the previous application of the references used in rejection of claim 22. However, after further thought, the examiner felt that specifying that first and second regions were to be laterally adjacent (or something of that nature) to preclude the possibility of the two regions on top of each other would provide a better chance of overcoming the previous application of the references. Any amendments will be fully considered when submitted formally for examination..